



Etymology of Irano-Bulgarian (Proto-Bulgarian) *kūr* → Bulgarian *кyp* [kur] ‘*membrum virile*’ and its Indo-European cognates

Chavdar Ivaylov Georgiev from Vratsa, Bulgaria, 6.06.2022

e-mail: chavdar.georgiev.66@gmail.com

Prof. Aharon Dolgopolsky in his scientific work “*Nostratic dictionary*” (1st edition 2008, 3rd edition 2012) reconstructs in the *Nostratic* proto-language* two roots that are phonetically and semantically very close: I. **qawlV ~ *qawElV ~ *qawolV* ‘leg, bone of a limb’, which in the *Indo-European* proto-language yields two roots: 1. **kaul-/ *kul-* ‘hollow bone, ?leg’; 2. **k^wel-* ‘limb’, and II. **qulU ~ *quLyU* ‘hollow stalk, reed, hollow (tubular) bone’, which in Proto-Indo-European yields **kaul-/ *kul-* ‘hollow stalk, tubular bone’ – the second root is *absent* from the 3rd edition of “*Nostratic Dictionary*”, most likely because the author considers that the *Proto-Indo-European* reflexes **kaul-/ *kul-* ‘hollow bone, ?leg’ and **kaul-/ *kul-* ‘hollow stalk, tubular bone’ are *identical*, hence the two *Nostratic* roots are also *identical*.¹ I also believe that **qawlV* and **qulU* represent one and the same root **qul-*, and the variant **qawe/ol-* with which prof. Dolgopolsky tries to explain the Proto-Indo-European **kaul-*, is *completely superfluous*, because **kaul-* is a root with **ā/*a-Ablaut*.² I believe that Proto-Nostratic **qul-*, more precisely **q^hul-*** ‘long hollow cylindrical object: hollow stem of a plant; hollow, tubular bone of a limb’ yields two allomorphic Proto-Indo-European roots: 1. **kāwl-/ *kawl-* ‘hollow stem; hollow, tubular bone’ and 2. **k^wel-/ *k^wol-/ *k^wl-* ‘limb → body member’.

Further prof. Dolgopolsky in his “*Nostratic dictionary*” reconstructs the root **qUl/E* ‘penis’³. Since **qulU ~ *quLyU* yields Proto-Indo-European **kaul-/ *kul-*, it’s obvious that **qUl/E* can yield the same Proto-

*The most ancient language of the “intelligent man” (*Homo sapiens*) at the time of his dispersal across the expanses of Eurasia and North Africa – it is called “*Nostratic*” from Latin *nostrās, -ātis* ‘our native’, it is dated approximately 15 – 12 thousand years b.C., i.e. at the end of Ancient Stone Age (Paleolithic), at the time of mammoths, cave bears and cave lions.

**I prefer the simpler and phonetically more plausible transcription of prof. Allan Bomhard in his capital scientific work “*A comprehensive introduction to Nostratic comparative linguistics (with special reference to Indo-European)*”, 3rd edition 2018, instead of the unreasonably complicated transcription of prof. Dolgopolsky.

¹ *Dolgopolsky, Aharon: Nostratic dictionary*, McDonald institute for archaeological research/ University of Cambridge, Cambridge 2008, № 1914: **qawlV* or **qawElV*, p.1792-94;

№ 1918: **qulU* or **quLyU*, p.1795-96; ed. 2012, № 1914: **qawolV*, p.1987-89

² *Gąsiorowski, Piotr: Another long grade: non-canonical ablaut involving PIE *ā*, presentation, Leiden 2013

*Carrasquer Vidal, Miguel: PIE*a*, www.academia.edu, 2015, p.1: Skt. *kūlyam*, Latv. *kaūls*, Lith. *kāulas*, Gk. *kaulós*

³ *Dolgopolsky, Aharon: Nostratic dictionary*, ed. 2008, № 1918a: **qUl/E* ‘penis, ?vulva’, p.1796; ed. 2012, № 1918: **qUl/E* ‘penis’, p.1991

Indo-European reflex: Nostratic ***q^hul-** → Indo-European ***kāwl-/ *kawl-** and ***k^wel-/ *k^wol-/ *k^wl-**. It is surprising that prof. Dolgopolsky *does not propose any Proto-Indo-European reflexes of *q^hUÍ/E*, i.e. **q^hul-** ‘*membrum virile, penis*’! Most likely he is misled by the presumption of the majority of linguists that Ancient Greek **καυλός** [kawlós], Latin **caulis** [káwlis] ‘*penis*’ (both possessing such meaning *as part of the common semantics*), Bulgarian *widespread* word-taboo **кyp** [kur] and Khotan-Saka **kūra-** ‘*penis*’ (in Bulgarian and Khotan-Saka the mentioned meaning is *only*) are botanical and zoological *metaphors* – the Greek and the Latin words are metaphors of **καυλός** ‘*stem, trunk*’ and **caulis** ‘*stalk, cob (of cabbage)*’ and the Bulgarian word is a metaphor of Old-Bulgarian **кoυpъ** [kúrǫ] ‘*cock, rooster*’. I will immediately refute such *frivolous presumption* – *what is the guarantee that the reflexes of q^hul- ‘membrum virile’ listed by prof. Dolgopolsky do not have a metaphorical meaning???*! If the meaning of the Bulgarian word is metaphorical, it’s normal to use it also in its *direct* sense, but Bulgarians say “**немен**” [peté ɲ] in the sense of ‘cock, rooster’. *The metaphorical semantics cannot be an argument against the linguistic kinship of καυλός* [kawlós], **caulis** [káwlis], **кyp** [kur] and **kūra-** ‘*membrum virile*’, provided that these four words can be derived from a common Proto-Indo-European root! There is no way to positively determine whether ***q^hul-** ‘*hollow stem of a plant; hollow, tubular bone of limb*’ and **q^hul-** ‘*penis*’ represent two separate roots with identical pronunciation (homonyms) or it’s the same root with primary meaning ‘*hollow stem; tubular bone*’ and *secondary metaphorical* meaning ‘*penis*’ – more important is *the very fact that in three major groups of Indo-European languages (Aryan, Greek and Italic) there are words for membrum virile that from the point of view of every professional linguist are obvious cognates (etymologically related)!!!* Based on the idea of ***ā/*a-** Ablaut of prof. Piotr Gąsiorowski and Miguel Carrasquer Vidal, I reconstruct a Proto-Indo-European *root-noun* (Nom.sg.) ***kāwl**, (Gen.sg.) ***kāwl-es** ‘*hollow stem; tubular bone; membrum virile*’, to which I join the possessive suffix ***-ó-** and so we get ***kawl-ó-s** → Ancient Greek **καυλός** [kawlós] ‘*penis*’; I join the suffix ***-i-** and so we get ***káwl-i-s** → Latin **caulis** [káwlis] ‘*membrum virile*’.⁴

Contemporary Bulgarian *widespread* word-taboo **кyp** [kur] ‘*penis*’ also originates from Proto-Indo-European ***kawl-ó-s**: ***kawlós** → Proto-Indo-Iranian = Aryan ***kawlás** ~ ***kawrás** → Proto-Iranian ***kawráh** → (tauto-syllabic Aryan diphthong ***aw** before *stressed last* syllable → Irano-

⁴ Adams, J. N.: *The Latin sexual vocabulary*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London 1982, p.26-27, 72

Bulgarian = Proto-Bulgarian *ow → *ū) Irano-Bulgarian *kowráh → *kūráh → *kūrāh → *kūrə → **kūr** ‘*membrum virile*’ → Bulgarian **кyp** [kur]. Proto-Iranian *kawráh → Khotan-Saka **kūra-** and some *present-day Central Iranian dialect* words for a penis – Nā’ini **kur**, ǰwānsāri (Khunsari) **kur** ‘*penis*’ are the *direct cognates* of Irano-Bulgarian **kūr** → Bulgarian **кyp**.⁵ Today’s Bulgarian word **кyp** has nothing to do with Old-Bulgarian **кoуpъ** [kúrǫ] ‘*cock*’ – **кoуpъ** was used *simply as euphemism, i.e. as a substitute for an “indecent” word*, due to an external sound match (homonymy) with the Irano-Bulgarian word.

The Proto-Nostratic *q^hul- → Proto-Indo-European *k^wel-/k^wol-, to which is joined a suffix *-yo-, yields *k^wól-yo-s → Aryan *kályas ~ *káryas → Proto-Iranian *káryah → Proto-Middle-Iranian (with metathesis *ary → *ayr) *káyrə → Middle-Persian **kēr**, New-Persian **kīr** ‘*membrum virile*’. Aryan *káryas yields Balkan-Gypsy (Rōmani) **kar** ‘*penis*’.⁶

The Proto-Indo-European *k^wel- with a *doubled initial consonant (reduplication)* yields a nominative base *k^wi-k^wel- or *k^wə-k^wel- (*i-reduplication* ~ ə- “*schwa-secundum*”-reduplication) and after joining to it the thematic *-o-, one gets *k^wi-k^wél-o-s ~ *k^wə-k^wél-o-s → Aryan *čičálas → Rōmani **čičalo** [tʃitʃaló] ‘*membrum virile*’.⁷

⁵ Bailey, Harold: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge University press, Cambridge/London/N.York/Melbourne 1979, p.62

Cheung, Johnny: *Etymological dictionary of the Iranian verb*, Brill, Leiden/Boston 2007, p.250

⁶ The author of this scientific article knows the pronunciation and meaning of Balkan-Gypsy **kar** ‘*penis*’ from his Roma students.

⁷ Zoller, Claus Peter: *Aspects of the early history of Romani*, Acta Orientalia 2010: 71, p.243 – 312 (**čičalo**, ‘*penis*’ – p.271)